



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/504,236	02/15/2000	Swain W. Porter	112076-138321	7611

25943 7590 04/21/2005

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/504,236

Applicant(s)

PORTER, SWAIN W.

Examiner

April L. Baugh

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-7 and 9-55 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Referring to claim 1, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: a user computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site; the user computer providing a first email address received from an email service provider for use to register the user with said first web site; the user computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second website; and the user computer providing a second email address received from the email service provider, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34); wherein either the first and second email addresses were simultaneously pre-provided to the user computer by the email service provider, or each of the first and second email addresses is provided to the user computer by the email service provider in real time in response to a first and a second request (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider. AAPA teaches the email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing email address to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce

Art Unit: 2141

an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email through the provider.

Referring to claim 21, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42); the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider. AAPA teaches an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having the an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 24 Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving for a user, a first email address (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42); the e-device employing the received first email address to facilitate

Art Unit: 2141

communication between the user and a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); the e-device requesting and receiving for the user, a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address; and the e-device employing the received second email address to facilitate communication between the user and a second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider. AAPA teaches an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having the an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 28, Pennell et al. teaches a method comprising: providing at least a first and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the e-device for use by the e-device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 1-12 and 24-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach an email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an

Art Unit: 2141

email address. AAPA teaches an email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by a email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 39, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42), to selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP), and to select a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider. AAPA teaches the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of

distinct email addresses from an email service provider (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 41, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address in real time (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42), and correspondingly earmarking said first and second distinct email addresses to facilitate communication between a user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 24-34).

Pennell et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time. AAPA teaches enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring

Art Unit: 2141

and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 45. Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions design to provide at least an email address, that are separate and distinct, to an electronic device of the user for use by the electronic device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (column 1, lines 12-15 and 56-61 and column 3, lines 1-12 and 24-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address. AAPA teaches enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address (pg. 1, lines 21-26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed)

Art Unit: 2141

to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 3, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 5, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses provided by said email service provider to said user computer (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 6, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the method further comprises the user computer pre-obtaining the distinct email addresses from the email service provider (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 9, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises the user computer dynamically obtaining said first/second email address from the email service provider s the user computer registers the user with the first/second web site (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 12, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises the user computer notifying the email service provider of the usage of the first

Art Unit: 2141

and second email address, including addresses of the first and the second web site (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Regarding claim 13, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein each of said notification is performed integrally as said first/second email address is provided to said user for use to register the user with the first/second web site (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 14, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web site (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 20, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is a selected one of a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (column 1, lines 17-31).

Regarding claim 22, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 23, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selections of

Art Unit: 2141

the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 25, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the first email address to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Regarding to claim 26, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made integrally when the e-device requests for said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 27, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made after the e-device having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 29, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 31-42).

Referring to claim 30, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Art Unit: 2141

Regarding claim 31, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 32, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 40, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 39, wherein the programming instructions further enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to notify the email service provider of said selection of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 42, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 41, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to notify of said employment of the first and second email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and second CP/GCP (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 43, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications integrally when requesting for said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 44, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications after having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 46, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 47, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Referring to claim 48, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 49, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (abstract and column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42).

Art Unit: 2141

2. Claims 2, 4, 7, 10, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. and AAPA as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Linden et al.

Regarding claim 2, Pennell et al. and AAPA teaches the method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 4, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user

Art Unit: 2141

identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 7, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 6 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach of pre-generation of email addresses. Linden et al. teaches the method further comprises the email service provider pre-generating the distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by pre-generating email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Referring to claim 10, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA the method of claim 9, wherein each of said dynamically obtaining comprises the email service provider selecting said first/second email address (column 3, lines 1-12 and column 3, lines 35-42 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach pre-generation of distinct email addresses. Linden et al. teaches selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of pre-generated

Art Unit: 2141

distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by pre-generating distinct email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 11, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 9 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address. Linden et al. teaches the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of and AAPA by having the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

3. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of AAPA as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Kamiya et al.

Referring to claim 15, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches receiving emails addressed to said first and second email addresses; organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

4. Claims 16-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Flemming, III.

Regarding claim 16, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya teaches the method of claim 15 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya does not teach organizing of said received emails. Flemming, III teaches organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses were sent by said first/second web site or not (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56). Therefore it would have been

Art Unit: 2141

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA and Kamiya by organizing of said received emails because this notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 17, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 16 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses not sent by said first/second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first/second web site (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 18, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 17 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user. Kamiya et al. teaches said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to

Art Unit: 2141

an instruction of said user (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by having the deletion performed in response to an instruction of said user because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 19, Pennell et al. in view of AAPA teaches the method of claim 18 (column 1, lines 12-15 of Pennell et al.).

Pennell et al. in view of AAPA does not teach providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of AAPA by providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

1. Claims 33-38, 50-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,874,023 to Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. and further in view of Fleming,

III.

Regarding claim 33, Pennell et al. teaches of a email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user (column 3, lines 13-20 and column 3, lines 53-65), the first and second email addresses having been provided to an electronic (e-device) of the user for the e-device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second intended communication partner respectively (column 3, lines 1-12 and 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches a email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user; and the email service provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2141

further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 34, Pennell et al. teaches of email addresses (column 3, lines 1-20 and 35-42 and 53-65).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it

Art Unit: 2141

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 35, Pennell et al. teaches receiving emails by an electronic device (e-device) of a user, from an email service provider; and presenting by the e-device said emails for viewing by the user (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Flemming, III teaches receiving emails, from an email service provider, wherein the emails are

Art Unit: 2141

characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses; and presenting said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by having the emails characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 36, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 35 of email addresses (column 4, lines 9-21.).

Pennell et al. does not teach deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email

Art Unit: 2141

address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 37, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 36 of email addresses (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to user instruction. Kamiya et al. teaches deletion is performed in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by having deletion performed in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 38, Pennell et al. teaches the method of claim 37 of email addresses (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships

Art Unit: 2141

between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 50, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus (when the program instructions are executed) to receive emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user (column 3, lines 13-20 and 53-65), wherein the first and second email addresses having been provided to an electronic device (e-device) of the user for the e-device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second intended communication partner respectively (column 3, lines 1-12 and 35-42).

Pennell et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches receive emails addressed to a first and a second email

Art Unit: 2141

address of a user, and to organize said received emails based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 51, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 50, wherein the programming instructions (column 3, lines 1-20, 35-42, and 53-65).

Pennell et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 52, Pennell et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to receive emails from an email service provider, and to present said emails for viewing by a user (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the

Art Unit: 2141

detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Flemming, III. teaches receiving emails from an email service provider, the emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses, and to present said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 53, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 52, wherein the programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address.

Kamiya et al. teaches delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 54, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach perform said deletion in response to user instruction. Kamiya et al. teaches perform said deletion in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by performing said deletion in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 55, Pennell et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 54, wherein the programming instructions (column 4, lines 9-21).

Pennell et al. does not teach provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web based email control center for monitoring and providing a summary of the detected event information organized according to relationships between the user and network sites of Pennell et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to online information transaction systems in general: Gabber et al., Klug et al., Light et al., and Feinleib et al.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L. Baugh whose telephone number is 571-272-3877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER